

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace sheet 2 (Fig. 2) with replacement sheet 2 included herewith.

Fig. 2 has been amended as follows:

1. Reference numerals 18 and 20 have been added.

Please replace sheet 3 (Fig. 3) with replacement sheet 3 included herewith.

Fig. 3 has been amended as follows:

1. Reference numeral 84 has been added.

Please replace sheet 5 (Fig. 5) with replacement sheet 5 included herewith.

Fig. 5 has been amended as follows:

1. Reference numerals 112 and 114 have been added.

Please replace sheet 20 (Fig. 21) with replacement sheet 20 included herewith.

Fig. 21 has been amended as follows:

1. Reference numerals 500 and 504 have been deleted.

REMARKS

The instant Amendment is filed in response to the official action dated March 30, 2004. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The status of the claims is as follows.

Claims 1-31 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-17 and 28-31 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 18-27 stand rejected.

Claims 1-17, 23, and 27-31 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 18, 21-22, and 26 have been amended.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the reference numerals **18, 20, 84, 112, and 114** mentioned in the description. The Applicants believe that the areas of objection have been identified and addressed in the foregoing amendments of Figs. 2-3 and 5. As such, the drawings, as amended, are considered acceptable.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference numerals not mentioned in the description: **19 and 24** of Fig. 2; **46** of Fig. 8; **54** of Fig. 11; **260, 262, 280, and 282** of Fig. 13; **302** of Fig.

14; and, **500** and **504** of Fig. 21. The Applicants respectfully traverse the objections relating to reference numerals **19**, **24**, **46**, and **54**, as hereinafter discussed. Specifically, reference numeral **19** of Fig. 2 is mentioned on page 11, lines 22 and 26, page 13, lines 30-31, page 14, lines 6, 8, and 16, page 15, lines 1 and 14, and page 17, lines 18, 21, and 26, of the application. Reference numeral **24** of Fig. 2 is mentioned on page 11, lines 25 and 27-28, page 12, line 12, page 14, line 25, page 17, lines 18, 21, and 29, page 19, lines 18-19, 23, and 30, and page 25, line 1, of the application. Reference numeral **46** of Fig. 8 is mentioned on page 12, lines 12, 15, 17, and 19, page 24, lines 30-31, page 25, lines 18-19 and 28-29, and page 26, line 29, of the application. Reference numeral **54** of Fig. 11 is mentioned on page 12, line 21, page 25, line 27, and page 26, line 27, of the application. The Applicants have amended the specification, as indicated above, to include description relating to reference numerals **260**, **262**, **280**, **282**, and **302**. The Applicants have also amended Fig. 21, as indicated above, to delete reference numerals **500** and **504**. Accordingly, the Applicants believe that the areas of objection have been identified and addressed in the foregoing amendments of the specification and the drawings. As such, the drawings and the specification, as amended, are considered acceptable.

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure because of the following informalities: Figs. 10 and 18-20 are not discussed in the detailed description of the invention. The Applicants respectfully traverse the objections relating to the disclosure, as hereinafter discussed. Specifically, Fig. 10 is discussed on page 25, line 25, to page 26, line 22, of the application. Fig. 18 is discussed on page 19, lines 1-17, of the application. Fig. 19 is discussed on page 23, lines 4-6, of the application. Fig. 20 is discussed on page 27, lines 5-12, of the application. It is respectfully submitted that for the foregoing reasons, the specification satisfies the applicable patent laws and rules and is therefore considered acceptable.

The Examiner has rejected base claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, on the grounds that there are antecedent basis concerns with the identified claim. Specifically, the official action indicates that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "said sender provided information" in claim 18. The Applicants respectfully traverse this ground for the rejection of claim 18. Specifically, the Applicants point out that the providing step of claim 18 recites "said handheld unit providing sender provided identification and security information to said server". The Applicants respectfully submit that the limitation

"sender provided identification and security information", as recited in the providing step of claim 18, is sufficient antecedent bases for the limitation "said sender provided information", as subsequently recited in the combining step of claim 18.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objection relating to the limitation "said sender provided information" of claim 18 should be withdrawn. The Applicants further submit that the areas of rejection relating to the limitations "the previous screen" and "the next screen" of claim 18 have been identified and addressed in the foregoing amendment of claim 18. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 18 satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112 and, as such, is in a condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claims 18-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ladd *et al.* (USP 6,269,336) in view of Dennis (WO 99/33293). Specifically, the official action indicates that the Ladd reference discloses the initiating, providing, combining, using, and welcoming steps of claim 18, but does not explicitly disclose the subsequent checking, re-sending, sending, and waiting steps of claim 18. The official action further indicates that the Dennis reference discloses the aforementioned

checking, re-sending, sending, and waiting steps of claim 18, and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Ladd reference to specify that the prompts disclosed therein be repeated if an error is detected before proceeding to the next prompts, thereby allowing a user to receive information in a timely and efficient manner. The Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the official action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and therefore the rejections of the claims under section 103 of the Patent Laws are unwarranted and should be withdrawn.

Specifically, the Ladd reference relates to a voice browser for providing interactive services. The Ladd reference addresses the problem of enabling users to access information from any location in the world via any suitable network access device (see column 2, lines 40-42, of Ladd *et al.*). To that end, a markup language is provided comprising a dialog element that includes a plurality of markup language elements, and a step element contained within the dialog element for defining a state within the dialog element. The step element includes a prompt element and an input element, in which the prompt element comprises an announcement to be read to the user (see, e.g., the ABSTRACT of Ladd *et al.*) and the input element corresponds to a user input.

The Dennis reference relates to a system for controlling personal information delivery to and from a telecommunications device. The Dennis reference addresses the problem of allowing an intelligent wireless service user to control all of the information that can be provided to a particular wireless device, without having to establish individual accounts and profiles with each information provider (see page 2, lines 2-14, of Dennis). To that end, the system of Dennis allows the user to establish a personal profile on a network to determine which types of information should be sent to the wireless device and to specify the format and timing of the information, and to maintain the personal profile on a personal profile server, which tracks the options selected by the user (see page 3, lines 2-10, of Dennis).

The Applicants' system relates to a support system for dial-up Internet communications, and more specifically to a system tailored for wireless dial-up access from mobile telephone personal data organizers (see page 1, lines 20-23, of the application). The Applicants' system solves the problem of having a handheld mobile web browser appear to be operating at such a high data rate and with such quick response that it compensates for Internet traffic congestion (see page 5, lines 3-6, of the application). To that end, the handheld mobile web browser

executes a quick handshake protocol for connecting the handheld unit to a server (see page 17, line 17, to page 18, line 32, of the application). The quick handshake protocol includes checking whether a complete screen had been sent to the handheld unit if the connection is a continuation of a previous connection that terminated abnormally, re-sending a previous screen when a complete screen had not been sent, sending a next screen of a sequence of screens when further screens remain to be sent, and waiting for sender input, as recited in base claim 18. The quick handshake protocol minimizes the obstacles presented by the wireless environment, thereby allowing the user to conduct his or her business with ease (see page 18, lines 26-29, of the application).

As indicated above, both the Ladd reference and the Dennis reference address problems related to accessing information over a network via a network access device such as a wireless device. Specifically, Ladd *et al.* address problems related to accessing information from any location using any type of network access device, and Dennis addresses problems related to controlling the delivery of such information. Unlike Ladd *et al.* and Dennis, the Applicants' system is not merely concerned with the access and delivery of information to a wireless device over a network, but

is instead focused on enabling a handheld mobile device with a visual screen to access information over the Internet, while minimizing the detrimental effects of slow data rates, intermittent connectivity, long download times, high traffic congestion, and sub-optimal graphical user interfaces (see page 4, lines 3-11, of the application).

Because the problems addressed by the Ladd and Dennis references are significantly different from the problem solved by the Applicants' system, there is no motivation to combine the Ladd and Dennis references as suggested in the official action to obtain at the subject matter of claims 18-27. Because there is no motivation to combine the cited references, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established, and therefore the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 are unwarranted and should be withdrawn.

Even if a *prima facie* case of obviousness were properly established, the suggested combination of the Ladd and Dennis references still would not render amended base claim 18 and the claims dependent therefrom obvious. This is because the suggested combination would neither teach nor suggest the steps of checking whether a complete screen of information had been sent if the connection between the wireless handheld unit and the server is a

continuation of a previous connection that terminated abnormally,
and re-sending a previous screen of information when a complete
screen had not been sent, as recited in amended claim 18.

As mentioned above, the official action indicates that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Ladd reference in view of Dennis to specify that the prompts disclosed therein be repeated if an error is detected before proceeding to the next prompts. The Applicants respectfully point out, however, that the "prompts" disclosed in the Ladd reference do not comprise "screens" of information, as recited in amended claim 18, but instead comprise voice communications such as an announcement to the caller, i.e., "Hi. This is your personal agent. How may I help you?" (see column 4, lines 19-22, of Ladd et al.).

Although Dennis discloses a wireless device **106** having a screen **108** (see page 12, lines 5-12, and Fig. 1, of Dennis), Dennis does not disclose checking whether a complete screen had been sent if the connection is a continuation of a previous connection that terminated abnormally, as recited in amended claim 18. In fact, Dennis makes only one reference to an abnormal communications event when he discloses that at times the wireless network **103** may be unable to connect callers to the wireless

device **106**, for example, if the telephone **106** is not turned on, when the user is outside the service area of the wireless network **103**, or when the telephone **106** is already connected to another call. In these situations, the user may choose to have incoming calls routed to a messaging application in the wireless network **103** (see page 11, lines 3-7, and Fig. 1, of Dennis). However, the Dennis reference provides no teaching or disclosure relating to checking whether a complete screen of information had been sent to the wireless device if the connection between the wireless device and the server is a continuation of a previous connection that terminated abnormally, and re-sending a previous screen of information when a complete screen had not been sent, as recited in amended claim 18.

Important advantages are derived from the method of connecting an extended wireless handheld unit to a server, as recited in amended base claim 18. For example, the method of amended claim 18 minimizes the obstacles presented by the wireless environment such as network traffic congestion, thereby allowing the user to conduct his or her business with ease (see page 18, lines 26-29, of the application).

Because of the deficiencies of the Ladd and Dennis references outlined above, the Ladd and Dennis references either taken alone

or in combination do not render amended base claim 18 and the claims dependent therefrom obvious. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103 are unwarranted and should be withdrawn.

The Applicants further submit that the suggested combination of the Ladd and Dennis references do not render amended base claim 21 and the claims dependent therefrom obvious. This is because the suggested combination would neither teach nor suggest a method of providing customized information to a user over a communications network including a private network and a public network, in which a first personal database area filled by the user is provided on a first server within the private network, and in which a search for the customized information progresses through the first personal database area and a plurality of database areas on other servers within the private network, and in the event the customized information is not found on the servers within the private network, checking at least one database area on at least one server within the public network, as recited in amended claim 21. The limitations of amended claim 21 are described throughout the present application, e.g., see page 13, lines 7-29, and page 27, lines 5-12, of the application.

The official action indicates that the Ladd reference does not disclose a personal database area provided by a second server within a region. Although the official action also indicates that the Dennis reference discloses the personal database area provided by the second server within the region, the Applicants respectfully submit that Dennis neither teaches nor suggests first and second servers within respective regions of a first territory of a private network, a third server within a respective region of a second territory of the private network, and a fourth server within the public network, as recited in amended claim 21. The Applicants further submit that Dennis neither teaches nor suggests searching for customized information by first checking at least the first, second, and third databases on respective servers within the private network, and in the event the customized information is not found, subsequently checking the at least one fourth database on at least one server within the public network, as recited in amended claim 21.

Important advantages are derived from the method of providing customized information to a user over a communications network including private and public networks, as recited in amended base claim 21. For example, the detrimental effects of slow data rates, intermittent connectivity, long download times, and high

traffic congestion are minimized (see page 4, lines 3-11, of the application).

Because of these further deficiencies of the Ladd and Dennis references, as outlined above, the Ladd and Dennis references taken alone or in combination do not render amended base claim 21 and the claims dependent therefrom obvious. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 21-22 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103 are unwarranted and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned Attorney to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of

Application No. 09/694,643
Filed: October 23, 2000
TC Art Unit: 2157
Confirmation No.: 9761

the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

CHUNG CHAN, ET AL.

By: 
Richard E. Gamache
Registration No. 39,196
Attorney for Applicants

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN,
GAGNEBIN & LEBOVICI LLP
Ten Post Office Square
Boston, MA 02109
Telephone: (617) 542-2290
Telecopier: (617) 451-0313

REG/pjd
Enclosure
311642